

REMARKS

The title is objected to as not descriptive. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Publication 2005/0263591 by Smith (hereinafter Smith).

For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicants' remarks are presented in substantially the same order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action. Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references.

Response to objections to title

The title is objected to as not descriptive. Applicants have amended the title to "APPARATUS, SYSTEM, AND METHOD FOR VERIFYING VALID ETHERNET INTERFACE ADDRESS" to cure the objection.

Response to objections to drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). As mentioned in the telephone conversation of December 18, 2007, Applicants are unable to find the phrase "validating interface addresses between user entities" in the claims, and therefore cannot amend the drawings to show the feature. Applicants request further guidance from the Examiner in putting the

drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.83(a).

Amendments to the Claims

Applicants have amended claim 1 with the limitation “...wherein the interface address is an Ethernet media access controller address and the communication module is an Ethernet network interface card...” The amendment is fully supported by the specification. See page 1, ¶ 2; page 8, ¶ 34.

Claim 1 is further amended with the limitation “...mitigate an invalid interface address by deactivating the network...” The amendment is well supported by the specification. See page 9, ¶ 38.

Claims 8, 10, 16, 24, and 30 are similarly amended. Claims 2, 6, 7, 9, 11, 15, 17-19, 25, and 26 are canceled.

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Smith. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 1, 8, 10, 16, 24, and 30 include the limitation “...determine whether the interface address is invalid, and to mitigate an invalid interface address by deactivating the network...” and “...wherein the interface address is an Ethernet media access controller address...” See claim 1 as amended. See also claims 8, 10, 16, 24, and 30 as amended.

In contrast, Smith teaches detecting Radio Frequency (RF) tags. Smith, page 1, ¶ 3.

Smith does not teach determining whether an Ethernet media access controller address is invalid, and mitigating the address by deactivating a network. Applicants therefore submit that claims 1, 8, 10, 16, 24, and 30 are allowable as Smith does not teach each element of the claims.

Claims 2, 6, 7, 9, 11, 15, 17-19, 25, and 26 are canceled. Applicants further submit that claims 3-5, 12-14, 20-23, and 27-29 are allowable as depending from allowable claims.

Conclusion

As a result of the presented remarks, Applicants assert that the application is in condition for prompt allowance. Should additional information be required regarding the traversal of the rejections of the claims enumerated above, Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler
Reg. No. 38,527
Attorney for Applicant

Date: December 19, 2007
8 East Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Telephone (801) 994-4646
Fax (801) 531-1929